

Exhibit A

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
HONORABLE PERCY ANDERSON, JUDGE PRESIDING

TRAFFICSCHOOL.COM, INC., et al.,)	
)	
)	
)	
Plaintiffs,)	
)	
)	
Vs.)	No. CV 06-7561 PA
)	
)	
EDRIVER, INC., et al.,)	
)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	
)	

REPORTER'S DAILY TRANSCRIPT OF TRIAL PROCEEDINGS

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 2007

LEANDRA AMBER, CSR 12070, RPR
OFFICIAL U.S. DISTRICT COURT REPORTER
312 NORTH SPRING STREET, # 442
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012
(213) 613-0179

Page 2

APPEARANCES

IN BEHALF OF THE PLAINTIFFS,
TRAFFICSSCHOOL.COM, INC., et al.: LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD &
SMITH LLP

BY: DANIEL C. DE CARLO, ESQ.

DAVID MAKOUS, ESQ.

MINA I. HAMILTON, ESQ.

221 NORTH FIGUEROA STREET

SUITE 1200

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012

(213) 680-5066

decarlo@lbbbslaw.com

IN BEHALF OF THE DEFENDANT, SHEPPARD MULLIN RICHTER &
EDRIVER, INC., et al.: HAMPTON LLP

BY: BRIAN DAUCHER, ESQ.

JOSEPH H. TADROS, ESQ.

650 TOWN CENTER DRIVE

FOURTH FLOOR

COSTA MESA, CALIFORNIA

92626-1993

(714) 513-5100

bdaucher@sheppardmullin.com

Page 3

INDEX

PAGE

POST-TRIAL SCHEDULING

4

Page 4

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA; THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 2007

10:09 A.M.

-000-

THE CLERK: This is CV 06-7561, trafficschool.com
versus Edriver.

Counsel, please state your appearances.

MR. MAKOUS: Good morning, your Honor.

David Makous, Dan De Carlo, and Mina Hamilton for
plaintiffs.

THE COURT: Good morning.

MR. DAUCHER: Good morning, your Honor.

Brian Daucher and Joseph Tadros for defendants.

THE COURT: Good morning.

All right. I think we need to set some deadlines
for post-trial submissions. I believe the defendants had
made a motion at the conclusion of the plaintiffs' case.

Do you wish to submit a brief on that motion?

MR. DAUCHER: Yes, your Honor. We could submit a
short brief on that motion separate from the closing briefs
perhaps.

THE COURT: Yes. Okay. I'm going to ask that you
file that by November 15th.

MR. DAUCHER: Very well.

THE COURT: And I'm going to ask the plaintiffs to
file their response by the -- let's see. Thanksgiving is

Page 5

what? The 22nd?

All right. Well, can you get your brief in by the
14th?

MR. DAUCHER: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Why don't you file your brief on
that issue by the 14th, and why doesn't -- the plaintiffs can
file their response on the 21st.

I'm going to ask the parties to file post-trial --
to modify or file new post-trial findings and conclusions of
law with citations to the record, and I'm going to ask that
you exchange those by the 16th. And then if you'll mark
those up and submit the final post-trial findings and
conclusions on November 26th. And then why don't the parties
submit their respective post-trial briefs on the 26th.

MR. DAUCHER: Your Honor, is the -- is the 26th the
Monday after Thanksgiving? I am returning to California that
day.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. DAUCHER: So --

THE COURT: Do you want --

MR. DAUCHER: -- two more days?

THE COURT: That's fine.

You want to put them in on the 28th?

MR. DAUCHER: That would be great, your Honor.

MR. DE CARLO: Your Honor, could that go with the

Page 14

1 And it does come in after the close of plaintiffs'
2 case. I don't see how it rebuts Mr. Lahoti's testimony in
3 the rebuttal case.

4 MS. HAMILTON: May I be heard, your Honor?

5 THE COURT: Yes.

6 MS. HAMILTON: I believe the Federal Rules of
7 Evidence say that judicial notice can be taken at any time
8 during the trial process, and our rebuttal case has not yet
9 closed.

10 THE COURT: I'm sorry?

11 MS. HAMILTON: I believe the Rules contemplate that
12 judicial notice may be taken at any time during the pro --
13 trial process, and our rebuttal case has not been closed at
14 this time.

15 As to relevancy, we would submit that it goes to
16 the weight. And you can do what you wish with the evidence,
17 but it is a certified copy and subject -- the cases say --
18 subject to judicial notice.

19 THE COURT: I'm sorry. It's a certified copy of
20 what?

21 MS. HAMILTON: Of the records from the United
22 States Patent and Trademark Office of the California DMV's
23 notice of opposition to the trademark application filed by
24 the defendants for the trademark DMV.org in 2007.

25 THE COURT: Okay.

Page 15

1 MS. HAMILTON: They sum -- sorry.
2 They summarize that they object to the use of
3 DMV.org.

4 THE COURT: Okay. So this is something that's
5 actually filed by the State of California; correct?

6 MS. HAMILTON: That's correct.

7 THE COURT: Okay. And that is to rebut what
8 evidence that came out during the defendants' case?

9 MS. HAMILTON: It's to rebut that the defendant
10 Raj Lahoti considered the matter closed by the DMV in 2004
11 and he -- he believed the matter was closed by the California
12 DMV.

13 We don't have the -- we didn't have the DMV
14 witnesses testify, but they do not consider the matter
15 closed, and this is evidence that goes to that fact.

16 THE COURT: When did he testify to that?

17 MS. HAMILTON: Yesterday, your Honor, or the first
18 day of trial, I believe actually.

19 THE COURT: And the request for judicial notice --
20 when was this? When was this opposition filed by the DMV?

21 MS. HAMILTON: The opposition was filed April 24,
22 2007. We just received, I think three or four days ago, the
23 certified copy of the opposition. But it -- this
24 information -- the exact opposition was attached previously
25 to a declaration submitted by the California DMV in the

Page 16

1 summary judgment papers. So defendants have seen -- have
2 seen this document.

3 THE COURT: Okay. Hold on just one minute.

4 Okay. I'll allow the defendants to --

5 Do you have an objection to this submission?

6 MR. DAUCHER: We -- in addition to what we have
7 stated, there would be two. One is renders incomplete the
8 record because there is a letter that could have been
9 introduced which was sent by plaintiffs to various states
10 agitating forward these oppositions.

11 The second question that this raises is that in the
12 opposition by DMV, the DMV gives its opinion about our use of
13 our domain name. And although we don't dispute that that's a
14 record of the State of California, I -- I'm not sure that's
15 the position of the State of California or that that would be
16 admissible as opinion testimony in the case.

17 THE COURT: Well, I assume that the only -- that
18 the only purpose for which it's being offered is to rebut his
19 statement that -- and quite frankly I don't remember it, but
20 that if, in fact, he said that as far as he knew the
21 California Department of Motor Vehicles considered the matter
22 closed, that's only -- that's the only purpose for which it's
23 being offered.

24 I assume.

25 MS. HAMILTON: That's correct, your Honor.

Page 17

1 MR. DAUCHER: And we would like perhaps the
2 opportunity to review the record and see if he says that or
3 not and maybe offer a one-page, two-page brief or perhaps
4 the --

5 THE COURT: Do you have the citation in the record
6 as to where that testimony is?

7 MS. HAMILTON: Not right now, your Honor. I can --
8 I believe --

9 THE COURT: Well, if you're asking to offer this in
10 your rebuttal case, it would seem to me that you would have
11 been able to point to something -- you've been able to point
12 to the record. I think you've probably been getting daily
13 transcripts to tell me that "Here's" -- "Here's the
14 statement. Here's where he made it, and this is why it's
15 rebuttal."

16 MS. HAMILTON: If I could have five minutes, your
17 Honor, I'd be able to do that.

18 THE COURT: Okay. You can have five minutes or
19 whatever you need.

20 Let me -- okay. Anything else?

21 MR. DE CARLO: Yes, your Honor.

22 As part of our rebuttal case, the Court may recall
23 the exchange yesterday with Mr. Moretti where --

24 THE COURT: Hold on one second.

25 Okay. Have you got anything else?